Nimbus Hatchery Weir Replacement Project

Summary of Discussion Forums

DRAFT

March 12, 2004

Prepared for:

Bureau of Reclamation

Prepared by:

MIG, Inc.

Introduction

During the first week of December 2003, the Bureau of Reclamation held two discussion forum meetings at the CSUS Aquatic Center in Rancho Cordova, California. The meetings were held to inform and obtain input from the community about the Bureau of Reclamation's Nimbus Hatchery Weir Replacement Project. Approximately 85 community members attended one of the two meetings below held on December 3rd and 4th respectively.

Discussion Forum Background and Purpose

The Bureau conducted the discussion forums as part of an intensive outreach process in the winter of 2003. The purpose of this public involvement effort is to document questions from the community, identify issues & concerns, and solicit suggestions as key inputs to be considered as the Bureau determines a plan for replacing the weir. The final decision regarding replacement of the weir will take place in spring of 2004. The Bureau's final proposed plan will build in the community's feedback to help create a comprehensive proposal. The Bureau will also continually check back with the public during the planning and implementation process.

Discussion Forum Overview

Both of the discussion forums were convened by the Bureau of Reclamation, with assistance from consultants from EDAW and MIG, Inc. The first item on the agenda was a background presentation, which was followed by a brief group discussion. An open house discussion followed group discussion. The four open house stations were focused around the following specific topics:

- Project Overview
- Construction Activities
- Fishing Activities
- Other Planning Efforts

Dave Robinson, Project Manager for the Bureau of Reclamation, provided participants with an overview of the weir's history and the proposed design alternatives for the replacement structure. He began with a presentation about the weir's history, current design faults, and new requirements that the Bureau must achieve. Mr. Robinson presented background information on the two main design alternatives. This information helped to provide participants with a context for the group discussions and open house that followed the overview presentation.

All comments received during each of the discussion forums were recorded on flip charts by Bureau of Reclamation, EDAW, and MIG staff for subsequent review and analysis. The

following pages contain a summary of all participants' comments received during the discussion forum. Additional comments that were received after the discussion forums were also collected and are included in the report as Appendix A, B and C.

Report Organization

This summary is organized into the following sections:

- Introduction
- Summary of Issues
- Discussion of Alternatives
- Appendix A: Comment Sheet Transcriptions
- Appendix B: E-mailed Comments

Summary of Issues

This section presents a summary of the key issues discussed at the workshops:

- Fish Habitat and Spawning
- Fishing Access/Regulations
- White Water Course Issues
- Recreation and Other Access
- Construction
- Costs
- Ongoing Operations and Maintenance Requirements
- Water Flows
- General Project Issues

Fish Habitat and Spawning

Participants emphasized the importance of choosing the alternative that best supports salmon and steelhead spawning. There was strong interest in preserving and enhancing spawning grounds. Specific comments included:

- Implement the alternative that has an efficiency of harvest advantage that would provide a fishery benefit.
- Identify and spawn spring run salmon and expand the hatchery operations to include taking early season runs of salmon.
- Use the project to experiment with fish habitat enhancements, including enhancing Steelhead spawning habitat along the shoal area.
- Maintain cold-water temperatures for spawning.
- Consider options for allowing the salmon to go around the dam and further upstream to access more of their original habitat. This would address the original purpose of the hatchery, which was to mitigate for the loss of salmon and steelhead habitat.
- Enforce the current snagging restrictions and minimize poaching as much as possible.
- Make the area upstream of the hatchery only available for catch and release fishing.

Fishing Access/Regulations

Many workshop participants fish in the project area. They expressed concern about the potential loss of access to fishing that might occur under either alternative. There is a perception that access has been reduced by previous actions on other parts of the American River, which would increase the impact of any loss of access associated with this project.

Alternative 1 Shoal Access. Participants' primary concern is that Alternative 1 (the extended fish ladder) would reduce access to the shoals and result in the enlargement of areas closed by Department of Fish and Game (DFG) regulations. Participants want greater information on how the fishing regulations would change if Alternative 1 were adopted. A concern is that DFG might change regulations in the future to restrict fishing to the area below the USGS cable.

Impacts on Areas Below the Weir. There was also a concern expressed that removing the in-stream structure would result in fewer fish being re-directed to downstream fishing areas. Participants requested that the potential reduction in fishing opportunities at Sailor Bar and the other shoal areas further downstream under Alternative 1 be addressed.

Alternative 2 Impacts on Areas Above the Weir. Some concern was expressed that Alternative 2 would create an impassable barrier and prevent all fish from passing upstream during some times of the year. This was seen as reducing fishing opportunities since the current weir has gaps, which allow some fish to pass upstream. Participants suggested that a replacement weir include methods to allow upstream passage of fish, including juvenile steelhead that would then spawn in the shoals.

Fishing Access for People with Mobility Impairment. There was a desire to preserve access for fishing for people with disabilities.

White Water Course Issues

Many workshop participants were advocates of developing a white water course in the project area. They requested that the project not preclude the development of such a white water course. These participants referenced a previous effort to develop a world-class white water facility. They cited the popularity of white water sports, the potential economic benefits to the area of a course, and the potential for a course to attract visitors to the area. These participants sought to have the economic and social impacts of whitewater recreation considered in the environmental assessment.

The whitewater course advocates also requested that boating safety be considered in the project decision. They asked that the old weir be removed in a way that eliminates any hazards to boating if Alternative 1 is chosen. They also felt that the low head dam in Alternative 2 would also create a hazard to boating.

Participants requested development of play feature in the old weir's location if it is removed. They suggested development of a natural play area using rocks, similar to San Juan rapids.

Recreation and Other Access

Many participants wanted to preserve access to safe recreational and other uses in the project area. Concerns were raised about a) access to the Hatchery, b) access to the multi-use trail, c) access to sufficient parking, and d) continued provision of free parking.

Multiple Uses Under Hazel Avenue Bridge. A specific concern was that Alternative 1 would

require careful planning to avoid unsafe conditions under the Hazel Avenue Bridge. The concern was that the area under the bridge is narrow and having a fish way, a multi-use trail, and pedestrians viewing the fish ladder could be unsafe, especially for small children who are not as attentive as adults.

Connection between Trail and Hatchery. A suggestion was made to create a walking path, on west side of Hazel Avenue at elevation of the ladder to connect the bike trail and the north side of the hatchery.

Community Uses/Collaboration. Participants felt that recreation uses could be enhanced, especially with the extended fish ladder. A suggestion was to coordinate the development of Alternative 1 with the City of Rancho Cordova to identify recreational or educational elements that would benefit the community.

Construction

Participants identified several issues regarding construction.

Minimizing Negative Impacts on Homes. A goal expressed by participants is to minimize the affect of construction on nearby homes. Participants asked how the Classics I development adjacent to the Bureau of Reclamation's 19-acre site would be affected by fencing, dust noise, and lighting. A specific question was to determine the time the construction area would be lighted. In general, participants sought a comparison of impacts between the alternatives.

Construction Timing. Participants sought information on the difference in construction times between the alternatives, for example, the time of day and the time of year impacts would occur. Participants expressed a concern that the project schedule would be lengthened, and requested the development of a realistic final schedule.

Use of Staging and Borrow Areas. Participants asked for more information on the length of time the borrow area would be used, and the location of the staging areas. They expressed a desire to see the 19-acre site developed as a park-type area after its use in the project.

Security. Participants wanted to ensure that construction areas are fenced off and guarded by security staff.

Coordination with Other Construction. Participants felt it important to maximize construction safety by building the footers for the Hazel Avenue foot bride project before constructing Alternative 1. In general, it was recommended that construction be scheduled to coincide with the Hazel Avenue widening project. An opinion was expressed that the Bureau should choose the design that conflicts the least with the Hazel Avenue bridge enlargement and new bike bridge crossing.

Shoal Access. Participants asked if there would be access to the shoals during construction for fishing and access to the bike path.

Costs

Several workshop participants asked for information on the initial and operating costs. They sought to compare these costs for the four alternatives.

Ongoing Operations and Maintenance Requirements

Participants felt that the approach used in ongoing management was an important factor in selecting a preferred alternative. Participants felt that the extended fish ladder alternative might present a significant security issue. For example, there would need to be safeguards against poaching when fish are in the ladder. Some security options, such as fencing, might be visually unappealing and diminish enjoyment of the site as a park with a natural, open space feel. Participants also asked for information on how other unwanted uses of the ladder would be discouraged, for example, graffiti or loitering in the channel when it is not being used to direct fish to the hatchery. Participants did not mention potential maintenance issues for alternative 2 as frequently, though one participant suggested the use of a rotating device to clear debris from a new weir.

Water Flows

Participants asked for further clarification of the minimum flows needed for fish spawning, a white water course, and joint uses, and whether the alternatives could support these requirements. Specifically, information was sought on the economic and environmental impacts of these water allocations, including the impacts of high flow regulations on the proposed alternatives. Participants sought information on whether high flows are beneficial to maintenance of spawning habit by reduction of siltificaion in the channel.

General Project Issues

Several general comments were made:

- Share all comments submitted throughout the process, especially comments made by other agencies to the Bureau of Reclamation.
- Determine the likelihood that there will be a delay to the construction process due to the need that a full EIS will need to be completed.

Discussion of Alternatives

This section presents a summary of participant comments regarding the project alternatives under study. As the comments below indicate, stakeholder opinions are mixed with regard to the two "build" alternatives, with people supporting both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. There are also members of the public and stakeholders who support the "no build" alternative. (Appendix B includes emails that demonstrate this diversity of opinion and connect stakeholders to their positions.)

- Alternative 1: Building across Nimbus Shoals to bring fish to the hatchery.
- Alternative 2: Building a new weir in the river in approximately the same location as the existing weir.
- No-Build Alternative: Continuing to use and renovate the existing weir.

Alternative 1

Participants had mixed opinions regarding extending a fish ladder across the shoals. Some participants were very concerned about the potential of reduced access to fishing, while some supported a naturalized fish ladder as having aesthetic, spawning, and educational benefits.

Fishing and Recreational Access. As noted in the previous section, several participants fish in the area or use the multi-use trail and are concerned about continued access to these uses if an extended fish ladder is built. Participants requested that a clear description be provided of how access will be maintained. There is a strong concern that Alternative 1 will close too much of the river for fishing. A concern was that vehicle access to the shoals be maintained. A suggestion was to construct a walkway for recreational access to the shoals.

Safety. In addition to access, several comments addressed safety of fishers and recreational users. The concern was that the area under the Hazel Avenue Bridge is already narrow for pedestrians and bicyclists, and that adding a fish ladder will further constrict the space.

Maintenance. Participants asked for information on the methods to be used in keeping the fishing areas clean, suggested that the ladder would bring in more people and more trash.

Flood Risk. A request was to determine the potential likelihood that Alternative 1 will be flooded and wash out.

Aesthetic and Educational Benefits. Participants asked that the aesthetic benefits be documented, suggesting that the building of a natural channel will enhance the beauty of the area. Participants felt that the ladder could increase the visitation and public education possibilities at the hatchery. They suggested that interpretive displays be developed to support the hatchery's education programs, and a sub-surface viewing area be included.

Alternative 2

Participants made several comments regarding the option of developing a new weir in the river.

Impact on Fish. Participants asked how many salmon and steelhead would be able to pass upstream if the new weir is constructed. There was an interest in ensuring that some fish can swim upstream of the weir. To this end, a suggestion was to redesign the flow gates so the steelhead passage area is in the middle of the weir and not to the south side. There was a concern that, during the times when the upstream passage was closed, that there could be biological issues, such as overcrowding, disease transmission, and suffocation.

Safety. Participants wanted to ensure worker safety for operations and maintenance of the upstream replacement. Also, participants requested that the alternative address boater safety, given that the new weir would create a low head dam, which was seen as creating a hazard as significant as the existing weir.

Design. A participant asked whether new weir design had been tested in other places to prove its effectiveness. Other participants suggested that public access be allowed across the new weir, and that the new weir be placed at the same angle as the existing weir. An innovative suggestion was to develop a rotating weir with water flow or mechanical movements that would flush out debris.

Construction. Participants asked what potential disturbances might occur to the north side bank and slope, and what river flows would be during construction.

Project Purpose/No-Build

Some participants requested additional evidence and justification indicating that the old weir structure is beyond repair and needs to be replaced. They suggested consideration of the no build alternative. They believed periodic renovation and repair was viable and would have the fewest impacts and the lowest investment cost. Specific comments included:

- Consider the construction impacts of building. Bringing tractors and backhoes next to the river is a big risk to preserving the fish.
- The current weir design has allowed for juvenile fish passage, both steelhead and salmon due to its semi-porous condition. Occasional maintenance performed after high water events seems to have been very cost-effective.
- Compile historical costs of previous repairs and tabulated these for the EA to show accurate regarding direct expenditures that have achieved the status quo. Maintaining the current allows a lot salmon and steelhead to breed naturally river and in the hatchery; neither alternative would seem capable of achieving the same levels.

Appendix A: Comment Sheet Transcriptions

This appendix presents verbatim transcriptions of comment cards collected at the Discussion Forums.

Fisheries/Fishing

- Which alternative is best for the fish? Is there any difference?
- What is the impact of the type of structure in high flow regulation? Are high flow events beneficial to maintenance of spawning habit by reduction of siltificaion in the channel? What are the economic or environmental; impacts of these water allocations?
- Is there an efficiency of harvest advantage with any alternative that would provide a fishery benefit?
- Historical fishing access 365 days/year to mobility impaired. This should supercede other more recent demands. Will FREE parking be maintained for citizenry?
- I am in favor of including a white water course at Nimbus Fish hatchery. However, I wouldn't want to remove a fishermen's traditional place at the river so that boaters could hook a few ends. If issues of concern such as continual access to the "lower flat", yearlong fishing and the health of the fishery are maintained if even improved, then go ahead with the modified fish ladders project. P.S., What about just creating a play feature at the Old weirs?
- Recreation/fishing public access to flats downstream from Nimbus Dam?

White Water

- Remove weir – use rocks, etc to fashion a natural play area (similar to San Juan)
- Study and consider the economic and social impacts of whitewater recreation in EA.
- Remove hazards of weir and create a white water play area.
- Please consider future recreational white water options when completing this project.
- I actually relocated to Sacramento ~6 months ago specifically for the white water opportunities on the American River and surrounding areas.
- It seems that if replacing the existing structure is necessary, then diversion channel offers recreation the least amount of impact as well as opening opportunities to the community.
- Please replace the weir and create a white water course by removing the weir and creating the fish ladder. This way you will create and opportunity to create a white water park that will bring revenue and tourism to the area and open doors for further recreational and functional events? (ladder around nimbus dam if disease issues are dealt with).
- During the agency meeting construction of alternative 1C was proposed as a smaller fish channel at the bottom with a larger boating channel built over the fish channel. So that

initial construction of IC would need to be built for both fish and kayaks. This is different than what was said today, this IC would be built for fish only and changed later to permit kayaking. That is also highly inefficient construction planning.

- The White water course opportunity should be preserved with or without Olympic bids.
- White water play area
- Could a white water feature be created during the removal of the existing weir structure? The existing weir could be used to construct the feature.
- Building a white water course will bring people and money to this area. Rafting and kayaking could be a source of money to this region if supported by local government.
- Would like to see complete weir removal and addition of naturalized fish channel to facilitate more recreation for boaters. White water park would be extremely beneficial to Sacramento tourism as well. PLEASE CARRY OUR VOICES ON!!!

Construction Activities

- Alt. 1A, B, C would disturb a larger area than Alt. 2 (However it is not exactly a pristine area.)
- Building in the main channel far more impact than working on the shoals.
- What is the true footprint of the projects in both width and depth?

Alternative 1

- Go with fish ladder – 1A, B, or C.
- Alternatives 1 A & B sound best as long as environmental & recreational (whitewater course) considerations are considered.
- It is quite narrow underneath the Hazel Ave. bridge. To have a fish way, bicycle trail and pedestrians looking at fish all in the same narrow areas needs very special planning with good separation. Especially for small children who would not be as attentive as adults. Alt 1A, B, or C.
- Alternative A & B sound best – natural
- I am extremely interested in alternative 1A and 1B – as it allows for a naturalized whitewater course.
- I love Sacramento – because of our wonderful American River Parkway! I think the creation of a beautiful naturalized channel for a new fish ladder would make our river even better. The alternative 1C offers more potential for recreation and is therefore my preference. The existing weir pr a replacement are safety hazards and eyesores, so I would like support removal and no replacement of the weir. Thoughtful reclamation of that area of the river could add to the beauty and recreation of the whole area.
- I'd like the old weir to be removed: It seems cheaper, it seems easier, and a new weir will still be hazardous.
- Maintenance/Operation - Would Alt. A,B, or C require more ongoing costs than Alt. 2? Consider both flood releases and flushing flow releases.

Alternative 2

- Weir is best alternative. Options 1A-1B-1C close too much of the river.
- Alt.2 – Some fish could be released upstream of the weir both for fishery and so they can use the existing spawning areas between the weir and Nimbus Dam.
- Alt. 2: has this design been used well in other places or tested?
- Security Alt. 2 provides greater security with all facilities in a compact area. Under Alt. 1A, B, C much of fish way would be more remote. Could fish poaching out of the fish way and/or vandalism be of concern? Fencing both sides of the fish way would not be attractive.
- Employee Safety – any issues with Alt.2?
- Alternative #2 has the advantage of opening and closing the gate on a daily basis (as I understand it). So it would be possible to harvest an early run. It also keeps the river above the bridge open for fishing. I believe a spillway or something could be added for the juvenile steelhead to pass through.

No Action

- Need to consider rebuilding existing weir. Compare long-term maintenance costs.
- I think it is great to preserve and maintain the fish ecological habitat. I am concerned with the construction activities such as building the ladders/kayak facility/etc. Bringing tractors and backhoes next to the river is a big risk. Your chance to preserve the fish could be ruined by fixing something's that is not broken.
- The current weir design has allowed for juvenile fish passage, both steelhead and salmon due to its semi-porous condition. Occasional maintenance performed after high water events seem to have been very cost-effective.
- I oppose alternative 1A, 1B and 1C. I like the style of the existing weir and the location.
- The costs need to be compiled from historical repair episodes and tabulated for the EA to be accurate regarding direct expenditures that have achieved the status quo we now ENJOY. There's lots of salmon and steelhead breeding naturally in the weir, in the hatchery above the weir and below the river. It's hard to imagine any equal or better result by realizing alternative 1A, 1B, or 1C. It's hard to imagine and equal or better result by realizing Alternative 2, without making it a porous structure.

Other Planning Efforts

- White water course – That certainly has the potential to be a preemie adjacent to the CSUS Aquatic Center. Alts. 1A and B appear to pose a potential conflict.
- Hazel Ave. bridge enlargement and new bike bridge crossing. – If Alt 1 A, B, C is chosen the design to avoid a potential conflict.
- Public visitation and education at hatchery. Alt. 2 keeps all parts of the picture in one compact area. Better for school groups.
- Work with Sacramento county: DERA of Planning & Parks if borrowing fill material in

the bureau's 19 acres.

General

- Believe it is not a FONSI issue – request EA at very least
- What are the minimum flows (CFS) for fish vs. kayaking? Kayak course vs. joint course?
- Eliminate the weir and put in a more permanent structure. Go with alternative 1C or alternative 2.
- Remove the old weir

Appendix B: E-mailed Comments

This appendix presents email messages sent to the Bureau after the December meetings.

David C. Ford - Northern California Council, Federation of Fly Fishers

This is to provide the Northern California Council, Federation of Fly Fishers, input on the subject project. We are an organization of 27 fly fishing clubs and 800 individual members and are vitally interested in steelhead in the American River. The American is close to the major urban centers of northern California and provides of sports fishing opportunities for a substantial portion of the Northern California population.

Accordingly, we are pleased that a key reason for the s project is to provide more spawning and rearing habitat for steelhead.

We believe the most effective alternative is Alternative 1.a, the southernmost route for the fish ladder. This will open more fishing area below the hatchery and also increase the area where fishing is closed, thereby protecting steelhead habitat. The area involved has been identified as good habitat for juvenile steelhead, badly needed on the American. We also feel that measures to enhance steelhead spawning, such as adding gravel and boulders similar to what has recently been accomplished on the Mokelumne River, should be part of the project.

Thanks for allowing us to comment.

Bill Felts - California Fly Fishers Unlimited

I am writing on behalf of the 220 members California Fly Fishers Unlimited Club to support the selection of Alternative 1A for the replacement of the Nimbus Fish Weir Project. I attended the recent BOR meeting at Lake Natoma, and from that meeting I am convinced that this alternative is in the best interest of the long term health of the steelhead and salmon in the American River. It will protect the fishery habitat near the Dam, and the fish ladder will provide interpretative and educational benefits for the public.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

Joseph Merz

Thanks for the update on the Nimbus Ladder project. It sounds like a great idea. I have several suggestions. Please take into account that I have not seen the full plans so I may be missing a little of the information.

1) The idea of a natural channel is excellent. However, if the channel needs concrete and riprap, it may be better to make a more permanent and engineered structure completely out of the potential spawning habitat that is already there. The reason I am saying this is that you will be trying to get a channel flowing the opposite direction of the river. During very high flow situations, the potential for the partially "natural" channel to blow out during the steelhead run would be quite high.

2) Secondly, if any concrete or permanent structure is needed, it would displace potential spawning habitat in that area.

3) I recommend that you get the new hatchery ladder or channel out of the river channel completely. Then, groom and maintain the gravel upstream to maximize more "naturalized" spawning and rearing habitat.

4) I could see making some type of "natural" channel that the fish could use to access the hatchery or spawn in but if it blew out in high flows, it would affectively disconnect the river form the hatchery. If flows were too high to get in to fix, hatchery production would be cut off until maintenance could be done. If flows were low enough to get in with heavy equipment, the work would potentially damage any redds that had been built in the area.

5) I also recommend that if you don't already have a geomorphologist on board to assess sediment mobilization, sediment budgets and hydrology of the area, you get at least one on board as soon as possible. Kris Vyverberg of the California Department of Fish and Game is already performing gravel enhancement projects in the lower American River for salmon and steelhead. She would be very helpful. Also, Greg Pasternack, from UCDavis has been doing some really good modeling of spawning gravel for us and on several rivers up north. He would also be good to talk to.

Please keep me updated on what is happening. I would really like to look at the feasibility of this for the lower Mokelumne River.

Mr. William Back - California Inland Fisheries Foundation, Inc.

Overall Project: Current weir and ladder system have worked well for almost 50 yrs. Once weir is in, only smaller salmon are able to pass. Holes shown on presentation are downstream from weir. Photos appear to be prior to 1999 restoration. I don't feel the proposed project should be completed. If reaching mitigation goals are truly the mission, money would be better spent enhancing the hatchery itself to include additional raceways. Option 1 would lead to definite maintenance concerns due to high flows when gates are open.

Construction Activities: Spend tax dollars repairing existing weir!!

Fishing Opportunities: Far too many reductions in fishing areas have taken place in the past few years. The option 1 closure are far to restrictive. The arc itself is understandable and would have little impact fishermen using the area now. The straight lines are the areas that concern me. Thousands of anglers that use this area would no longer be able to, myself included. I fish the wall and have for the past 30 years. I know the wall area is a concern in the enforcement area but I feel this can be controlled with adequate warden pressure. A better option would be to put a zero limit in place during sensitive months. This should be put in place in the basin as well as other areas of the river. This would generate a considerable amount of revenue for the state which would pay for additional enforcement. I know many law-abiding anglers that would support this. I don't feel the public was properly notified of this meeting. I would urge another meeting with spots on the two local sports radio show and also a mailer to local fishermen using DFG mailing list.

Mr. Clifford Gormly - Kayaker

Overall Project: As a kayaker, I know that integrating a whit water kayak slalom facility as part of the fish weir replacement project would provide a tremendous recreation opportunity for kaykers nationwide, producing a great revenue generator for whomever would receive the proceeds.

Construction Activities: I am not an expert on the costs of the weir project, but it would appear that a well thought out naturalized fish channel may cost more to initially build, but the long-term recurring maintenance costs would be cheaper for a naturalized fish cannel than an instream diversion weir. As a logistics engineer, experience has proven to me that maintenance costs usually exceed acquisition/construction costs by a fair margin.

Mr. Donald W. Alden - Lake Natoma Rowing Association

Overall Project: Design, in vicinity of the proposed bicycle-pedestrian bridge over the American River, needs to be coordinated with the County Department of Public Works. Possibly the bridge footings may need to be constructed before the man-made "ladder" stream.

Other Planning Efforts: If white-water kayak course is build, parking facilities in this area may not be adequate. The present parking lot is some times insufficient for use by Aquatic Center, fishermen, and bike trail users.

Mr. Ronald S. Castori - Fishing Angler

Overall Project: I am an avid steelheader and have been fishing Nimbus basin/shoals for the last 25 years. I am in favor for alternative 2; keep the basin as in and replacing the old weir with a new one. I am against alternative 1A, 1B, & 1C. The steeled fishing that occurs at Nimbus basin shoals after the weir is removed each year is and can be great, and outstanding fishing. Some of my best fishing has occurred there. For this reason, I do not want to see any changes on restriction if fishing in the Nimbus basin.

The Olympic kayak watercourse proposed is ridiculous; there are many rivers close-by for their activities. Do not mess with an area (Nimbus basin/shoals) that offers great fishing and access to the public at no charge and easy access (even for people that have disabilities)

If any of alternatives 1A, 1B, 1C are selected (which I am totally against) is the intent to take both salmon and steelhead thru the new extensions or canals? Or is it conceivable that steelhead could be taken up the old ladder, since they don't need a weir to turn them.

If steelhead and salmon both will be taken only thru new ladder extensions, then Nimbus basin/shoal area will need to stay closed past the January 1st normal opening date by several months. If the old ladder can stay open for steelhead only, this extended closure would not be necessary. In conclusion, an alternative 2 is the best option that will not affect the fishing at Nimbus basin shoals. I am in favor of keeping things simple, and as they are as opposed to the changes proposed by alternatives 1A, 1B, 1C. I am opposed to any major change to Nimbus basin, because it can be one of the best places to fish on the American River at this time. "Leave it alone."

Mr. William H. Griffith - American Red Cross and California Canoe and Kayak

Past Sacramento County Park and Recreation Commissioner Retired Save American River Association Director 20 years

Overall Project: The old hatchery weir has been disintegrating for decades. I know because in the mid '60's I swam and crawled across the upstream face of the underwater footing and located numerous holes so DFG hatchery personnel could drop rocks from above to block those holes. Alternatives 1 A, B, and C would add about 1/3 mile of navigable waterway to the American River Parkway. Alternative C would allow the future development of a highly accessible and much needed and used white water canoe and kayak course.

Construction Activities: Alternative C will require borrow material. This would provide the opportunity to greatly enhance the borrow site to scenic wildlife habitat as mitigation.

Fishing Activities: Access to the added navigable 1/3 mile is essential for fishermen and fisherwomen visiting the banks prior to spawning closure. Also, this access is needed for car top boats (canoes and kayaks and rafts).

Other Planning Efforts: Lake Natoma presently provides internationally acclaimed rowing shell race water and highly used flat water (fundamental) canoe and kayak training sites. The lower American River provides excellent moving water training sites for canoes and kayaks. Alternative 1C and a future white water course would round out this area as an international attraction for rowers and paddlers.

Ms. Judy Reule - Classics No. 1 Housing Development

Additional Concerns: Residential units backing up to this area now enjoy relative solitude due to mounds of rock that will be removed for the project. Request that a heavy planting of screening shrubs and trees be considered for along this fence line when project complete.

Residential complex known as Classics No. 1 located on Gold County backs up to the area referred to as the "borrow" location. Concerns: (1) dust; (2) noise; (3) lights at night; (4) noise at night; (5) security.

Mr. Mark Rindal

Overall Project: The current system works well with quotas being met yearly. With no plans to increase yield, it seems the money can be better spent elsewhere. The Madd River Hatchery is closing because of no funds!

Fishing: If you can continue with plan 1, the only way to limit poaching and illegal activities would be to make the whole section above the cable to the hatchery. CATCH & RELESE ONLY. Then the fishermen can self-police.